

# CCB Meeting

## Decision Summary

Thurs., September 25, 2003  
 9:00 a.m.  
 Rockledge 1  
 OER Conf. Rm., Third Floor

### Requests Covered

	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type Of Request	User Impact	Document Title
01	Sara Silver	CGAP Receipt & Referral	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item1
02	Sara Silver	CGAP Receipt & Referral	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item2
03	Patti Gaines	Web QT	Defect Fix		CCB_09_18_2003_item3
04	Chanath Ratnanather	Change data reverse bridge	Bug fix	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item4
05	Diana Dixon	R & R	New Requirement	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item5
06	Cathy Walker	Checklists	Defect Fix	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item6
07	Tracy Soto	IAR	Reduction of Scope	Low	CCB_09_18_2003_item7
08	Mike Goodman	CGAP eRA Exchange	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item8
09	Mike Goodman	CGAP eRA Exchange	Requirements Correction	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item9
10	Mike Goodman	CGAP eRA Exchange	Requirements Clarification	Low	CCB_09_18_2003_item10
11	Vanessa Grandy	IEDison-044	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item11
12	Dan Hall	Commons	Re-Baseline of Bugs	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item12
13	Dan Hall	Commons	Baseline UI	None	CCB_09_18_2003_item13
14	Chanath Ratnanather	PGM	Requirements Changes and Defect Fixes	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item14
15	Vickie Fadeley	FSR	Scope Reduction	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item15
16	Patti Gaines	CRISP-on-the-Web	Requirements Change	Medium	CCB_09_18_2003_item16
17	Cathy Walker	GM	Reduction of Scope	Medium	CCB_09_25_2003_item1
18	Jim Tucker	-	Requirements Change	Medium	CCB_09_25_2003_item2
19	Sara Silver	CGAP	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_25_2003_item3
20	Vanessa Grandy	IEDison-045	Requirements Change	Low	CCB_09_25_2003_item4
21	Vanessa Grandy	IEDison-046	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_25_2003_item5
22	Vanessa Grandy	IEDison-047	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_25_2003_item6
23	Vanessa Grandy	IEDison-048	Requirements Change	Critical	CCB_09_25_2003_item7
24	Mark Siegert	Peer Review	Scope Reduction	?	CCB_09_25_2003_item8
25	Mark Siegert	Peer Review	Requirements Change	?	CCB_09_25_2003_item9
W1	Tracy Soto	All-Password Policy	Requirements/ Clarification Change	Medium	CCB_09_25_2003_w1
E1	Tim Twomey	Commons	Change to baseline configuration	High	Emergency

Request & Decision Summary					
	Submitted By	Area Affected	Type Of Request	Cost/Schedule Impact	Document Title
01	Sara Silver	CGAP Receipt and Referral	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item1
	<p><b>Request:</b> CGAP Receipt and Referral has a requirement for scrolling multiple PDF windows; opening multiple PDF images to correspond to a given application record, then automatically closing those images and opening the PDF images for the next record that is opened. A solution has been found that will permit this to be done. However, the complexity of the solution and the current resource shortage means that effective implementation of the solution may be problematic. Therefore, the requirements are being deferred, and interim requirements are being inserted for the pilot.</p> <p>For the three Receipt and Referral modules that are affected by this change, the new requirement will be to allow the user to open the desired images from the grant folder, which will be available on the screen.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Pre-Approved</p>				
02	Sara Silver	CGAP Receipt and Referral	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item2
	<p><b>Request:</b> Alternate Flow 2.2.1.4 of this use case is “The Actor Holds the Application for Further Work”. The use case was returning to the basic flow at the wrong step: the result would have been to move the application to the next process stage, even though processing had not been completed. This has been fixed; the steps associated with saving the application have been inserted into the alternate flow, and there is no return to the basic flow.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Pre-Approved</p>				
03	Patti Gaines	Web QT	Defect Fix		CCB_09_18_2003_item3
	<p><b>Request:</b> This request is to fix a bug in Web QT to make sorting case insensitive. As it is now, Web QT is incorrectly sorting data if there is a mix of lowercase/uppercase data items. This specific bug affects name fields and Project Title.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for Fall release</p>				
04	Chanath Ratnanather	Change data reverse bridge	Bug fix	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item4
	<p><b>Request:</b> Withdrawal of an amended grant application when an IC awards the previous version of the application does not generate a ROT email to the SRA. After some analysis, Lisa Chen, Stella Datoc and the e-Not analyst determined that the change data reverse bridge does not write the correct values to the transfer request table (the ROT process uses the transfer request table as a log, to determine what grant data changed). This request is to modify the change data reverse bridge process to create a "9037-transaction" record with a data_item_value = '0', for the withdrawal of an application when an IC awards the previous version.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Conditional Approval (see notes)</p> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The hours specified in request are approved. This item must be brought back to CCB, prior to applying any additional hours or resources. Since specific root cause is not yet determined, development must do further investigation and provide an update at the next CCB meeting.</li> <li>2. Deployment manager will determine deployment timing based on results of investigation.</li> </ol>				
05	Diana Dixon	R & R	New Requirement	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item5

	<p><b>Request:</b> As a part of the August 2003 deployment, 901 processing was modified to associate meeting records with all applications once reinstated. However, specifications were not given with regards to associating grants having temporary assignments (i.e. SRC 99).</p> <p>As a result, an Oracle error is raised because the system attempts to associate grants with invalid meetings.</p> <p>Modify 901 processing to only associate grants with valid meetings.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p>				
	Cathy Walker	Checklists	Defect Fix	High	CCB 09 18 2003 item6
06	<p><b>Request:</b> Four more bugs were discovered in Acceptance and Pilot testing that need to be included in a maintenance release in October if possible or in the November 7<sup>th</sup> release if not. This request is to add these 4 bugs to the 16 bugs that were originally scheduled to be deployed with the September 6<sup>th</sup> release and deploy them together as soon as possible. Since additional bugs continue to be discovered, Checklists are unable to pass acceptance testing and therefore could not be included in the September release. While the total development/testing hours for these 4 bugs are 29/2.5 hours respectively, I'm requesting 40/5 hours so that any additional minor bugs can be corrected if they are discovered and can be fixed in time to make the next release. The 4 new bugs are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CQ 6205 When the "Checklist Complete" button is pressed and the application displays the completed checklist, the header items are displayed as if they are questions with blank radio buttons. This makes the screen very difficult to read since you can't tell which are questions and which are headers. 5/5 hours</li> <li>2. CQ 6181 There is a session problem in PGM that promotes the Completed Checklist page to the next item on the hitlist even though that checklist has not been completed for that record. This results in incorrect data and much confusion. 5/5 hours</li> <li>3. The responses to two of the GM checklist items ("IC requirements met?" and "Other support reviewed?") are not promoting from checklists to GM Admin. The checklist items need to be the same in GM and Checklists as long as the pilot continues, which will now be until the Feb/March release. 5/1 hours</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Checklist Report button disappears from the screen after "Checklist Complete" is checked, therefore there is no way to print a completed checklist. This is a bug but there is a related requirements change which is that the report needs to be modified to include name and date/time completed. The requirements change may or may not be done depending on the priority of other bugs that may be discovered.</li> </ol> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved for Fall release</p> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. (Mike Wilson) Verify work can be absorbed in schedule. (Done. Mike confirmed the hours could be absorbed.)</li> <li>2. (Cathy Walker, Chanath Ratnanather) Assist with integration testing.</li> </ol>				
	Tracy Soto	IAR	Reduction of Scope	New	CCB 09 18 2003 item7
07	<p><b>Request:</b> In the IAR Scope for November 2003 release the following requirement was submitted: Help files in IAR should be separated from the IAR EAR as defined in Commons Supplemental Specification. This is no longer a requirement and has already been implemented.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Pre-Approved</p>				
08	Mike Goodman	CGAP eRA Exchange	Requirements Change	High	CCB 09 18 2003 item8

	<p><b>Request:</b> In order to integrate with the initial release of Grants.gov, the CGAP eRA Exchange must be able to parse, validate and store the “Core-Plus” application datastreams that we expect to receive from that source. While there are still some unresolved issues regarding portions of the Core-Plus collection of schemas, and questions regarding pre-submission validations, it is important that work be started on the portions that <i>are</i> relatively stable at this time.</p> <p>The “Intake Application From File” use case already contains the general processing requirements for any type of application datastream, regardless of whether that datastream is constructed using the CGAP 398 format or the Core-Plus format.</p> <p>So, the plumbing is in place for message intake. At this point we need to specify the Core-Plus message format, the XML schemas which will be involved, the cross-walk between the PHS 398 form and the schemas, and the mappings/validations which will be used to transfer these XML components into the eRA/IMPAC II database.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved, timing based on resource availability</p> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Per Mike Wilson, the 360 hours of work must be done after the October 10 code baseline for the Fall release.</li> <li>2. Concern that this effort could cut into documentation time.</li> <li>3. Time estimates should reflect: 360 hrs. design/development, 8 hrs. integration test, and 10 hours acceptance test.</li> </ol>				
	Mike Goodman	CGAP eRA Exchange	Requirements Correction	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item9
09	<p><b>Request:</b> Two corrections are required to the supplementary specification, in preparation for the upcoming Fall release of CGAP.</p> <p>First, a clarification must be added to the supplementary specification, to explain the rationale behind excluding certain XML components from the “validation” table that appears in section 10.1. The reason is simply one of economy, that certain schema components (and the sub-components that comprise them) are cross-agency but of no interest to NIH, so these do not clutter our mapping and validation tables. This is not specifically stated in the supplementary spec and has been the cause of some confusion, so this explanation is being added as a preface to the validation section.</p> <p>Second, it has been recently discovered that the signing official information was not previously addressed by the validation table as a “schema element of interest”, and consequently was not addressed in the data mappings. Having this information mapped to the database (not simply resident in the XML stream) is critical to the process that produces the grant image report. Without this mapping, PHS 398 face page block 13 (“Official Signing for Applicant Organization”) cannot be populated in the report. The signing official components are being added to the supplementary specification, section 10.1.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Notes:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Time estimates should reflect: 8 hrs. design/development, 8 hrs. integration test, and 8 hours acceptance test.</li> </ol>				
10	Mike Goodman	CGAP eRA Exchange	Requirements Clarification	Low	CCB_09_18_2003_item10

	<p><b>Request:</b> The current version of the CGAP Research &amp; Related schema currently models the “Animal Subject” component as a combination of (1) a required “VertebrateAnimalsUsedQuestion” and (2) a required sequence of IACUC assurance number and approval date.</p> <p>However, the assurance number/approval date sequence should not be required by the schema. These are applicable only when the answer to the VertebrateAnimalsUsedQuestion is “yes”, and even then are not absolutely required at the time of submission. So this sequence should be modeled as <i>optional</i>.</p> <p>This is a clarification only. Since this affects the cardinality of these tags in the schema (0..1 as opposed to 1..1) it should have little or no appreciable impact on the software that parses and maps the encountered tag structure into the IMPAC II database. However, once approved, this change does need to be disseminated to our Co-Op partners since it does impact their effort to generate the datastream they are sending us (making it easier for them).</p> <p>The schema file that has been corrected is checked into PVCS, in the following location: cgap\docs\artifacts\1.business_modeling\xml-schema\rarschema.xsd</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Pre-Approved</p>				
11	Vanessa Grandy	IEdison-044	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item11
	<p><b>Request:</b> In order to eliminate one of the problem scenarios discussed in one of the bugs already scoped for the October release of iEdison II (Bug ID <a href="#">Bug 5890</a>), a change also needs to be made to the PowerBuilder user interfaces. The following business rule is being requested to be added to the PowerBuilder user interface when a user is allowed to add or modify an invention disclosure:</p> <p>The “Date of 1st publication, on sale or public use” is a required field when the Invention Status is “BARRED”.</p> <p>Without this rule, one of the workflow scenarios described in the “Manage Patent Filing” use case for the iEdison II web user interface when managing a patent filing record cannot succeed.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> 1. Time estimates should reflect: 2 hrs. integration test</p>				
12	Dan Hall	Commons	Re-Baseline of Bugs	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item12

**Request:**

Based upon the deferral of a couple of framework related bugs from Friday's Commons Interim Release , a new bug discovered recently, and the discovery of a bug, which was thought to have been closed, the following bugs are to be rebaselined for inclusion in the 11/7/2003 release. There are 26 open bugs in Commons, however, only the High Priority Bugs are to be included in the 11/7 release.

<u>id</u>	<u>Headline</u>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Comments</u>
13009	eRA email Account in PPF. Personal Information only accepts 20 bytes	2 - High	Reopened Bug (Requires Estimate)
13010	Status Code is set to 0 even after an Account is approved in Maintain Profiles	2 - High	New Bug (Requires Estimate)
1573	PPF 6025 Maintain Profiles Detail -- Maintain Profiles Summary View does not sort on Name, causes Page Not Found Error	2 - High	Deferred from Commons CCB #34 (No estimate required)
13011	SuperUser prompts that user is active when they just closed their browser. In such cases their account is Active forever. This needs to be redesigned to fix. Can change the requirement to state if the above and last logged in greater than 1 hour bypass prompt. Also, SRA/GTA SuperUser Access still does not work. – Will not be fixed due to framework changes needed.	2 - High	Deferred from Commons CCB #34 (No estimate required)

**Decision:** Item 13009 – Approved for Fall release.

Item 13010 – Approved. Per Mike Wilson, this item needs additional research and may not be complete the October 10 code baseline for the Fall release.

Item 1573 – Done. Already in production.

Item 13011 – Approved for Fall release.

**Actions:**

1. (Mike Wilson) Verify work can be absorbed in schedule. (Done.)

	Dan Hall	Commons	Baseline UI	None	CCB_09_18_2003_item13
13	<b>Request:</b> I would like to baseline the URL <a href="http://erawebdev.od.nih.gov/UI/commons/StatusQuery/search.asp">http://erawebdev.od.nih.gov/UI/commons/StatusQuery/search.asp</a> as the prototype for Commons Status/JIT/Extension for the 11/7/2003 Release. Note that minor look and feel inconsistencies may apply as the developer is given consideration in accommodating backend implementation. Additionally, there should be no discrepancies between this UI and the associated Use Case artifacts. However, where discrepancies exist, the Use Case should be viewed as the primary source of requirements.				
	<b>Decision:</b> Pre-Approved				
14	Chanath Ratnanather	PGM	Requirements Changes and Defect Fixes	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item14

	<p><b>Request:</b>  Note: this request includes <u>SEVEN</u> requests. Each request has a separate cost and schedule impact.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Grant Snapshot has a field labeled T5 Receipt Date. This field is misleading on competing grants. Rename field to “Appl/Progress Rpt Receipt Date” (need Sherry’s input on this).</li> <li>2. Original requirement set the PGM Attention Flag to “Yes” if the Phase 3 Clinical Trials Flag is either 'Y' or 'X'. This should be changed to set the PGM Attention Flag to “Yes” only if the Phase 3 Clinical Trials Flag is 'Y'.</li> <li>3. On some grants, the Grant Snapshot is not accessible. The analyst is unable to determine if a pattern exists to this bug.</li> <li>4. The Post Award page is displaying double grants in certain scenarios. Dev needs to filter out the person records with a version code of 'O' on the Post Award/Active Grants portfolio pages.</li> </ol> <p>Clarify discrepancies between the Program Approvals page UI prototype and the requirements. Due to resource restrictions and the dropping of other PGM requirements, the “Perform Program Approvals UC” was revived and added to the requirements 2 weeks after the final freeze of August 15. This UC didn’t go through reviews, and was not complete at the time of baseline.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The Program Approvals UI shows buttons accessing the Checklists and PO Worksheet, but the "PGM UC Model Survey" does not display an extends relationship to the “Edit Checklists UC” and “Access Reports UC”. The PGM Supp Spec should also indicate the specific checklist and report that’s accessed.</li> <li>6. The Perform Program Approvals UC has a “modify data flow” (flow 2.2.1.1), but the PGM supp spec does not show what data can be modified (the UI prototype does indicate this). Need to add to the supp spec what data can be modified in this UI.</li> <li>7. Due to the removal of Org Layers as a PGM October 2003 feature, a separate business rule is required to identify the transaction limitations on a portfolio. The new business rule will implement the same limitations as ICO (i.e. all users within an IC will have transaction authority on a Program portfolio)</li> </ol> <p><b>Decision:</b> Items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7 are Approved  Item 3 requires further investigation and is deferred</p> <p><b>Actions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. (Patti Gaines, Chanath Ratnanather) Provide further fault isolation testing for Item 3.</li> <li>2. (Mike Wilson) Verify work on Items 6 and 7 can be absorbed in schedule. (Done. Mike confirmed the hours could be absorbed.)</li> <li>3. (Patti Gaines) As a follow-up to Item 1, put similar requirement in Web QT for future release.</li> </ol>				
	Vickie Fadeley	FSR	Reduction	High	CCB_09_18_2003_item15
15	<p><b>Request:</b>  Use Case Specification: FSR Supplementary Specification document contains a detailed description of the calculation needed for the “Unexpended Balance from Prior Project Period” on the FSR Long Form. This process should be re-analyzed to ensure the FSR Users are not adversely affected by displaying incorrect data. I am requesting that this new calculation be deferred from release in October, to allow OFM and analyst time to re-evaluate data flows necessary to produce accurate results in the “Unexpended Balance” calculation. Currently, in production, the item is defaulted to zero.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Pre-Approved</p>				
16	Patti Gaines	CRISP-on-the-Web	Requirements Change	Medium	CCB_09_18_2003_item16

	<p><b>Request:</b> The CRISP on the web team leader needs the ability to execute the CRISP Replication procedures from her developer account in production. The CRISP Replication process is scheduled to run on Friday morning, but if the replication fails or is postponed for any reason, the team leader needs the ability to restart the replication programs after troubleshooting the problem. The team leader is in the process of documenting the CRISP Replication process. When the documentation is complete, we can begin the analysis to turn the manual execution of CRISP Replication over to Operations.</p> <p>The requirement was to create a database Role to grant EXECUTE privileges on CRISP Replication programs. However, during unit testing it was discovered that this database role did not work as expected. The Role would not work when the CRISP replication packages were submitted as a background jobs. The majority of the time these packages will need to be submitted as background jobs. The alternative is to grant direct EXECUTE privileges to a schema. Initially this privilege will be granted to the team leader's schema. Another developer may temporarily need the EXECUTE privileges in the team leader's absence. This will be granted on an as needed basis.</p> <p>The original requirement states that privileges should be granted through a role. The new requirement is that the privileges should be granted directly to the schema. There is very little difference between these two approaches for development and integration testing.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Pre-Approved</p>				
17	Cathy Walker	GM	Reduction of Scope	Medium	CCB_09_25_2003_item1
	<p><b>Request:</b> Due to the continuing issues with Customizable Checklists it will remain in pilot rather than being fully deployed with the November 7<sup>th</sup> release. The main piece necessary to deploy Checklists in GM is to delete the current checklist items from the Admin screen and redesign the screen to more completely accommodate the new J2EE checklists. This is a request to reduce the scope of GM to exclude this effort, which was estimated at 40 hours of development time.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p>				
18	Jim Tucker		Requirements Change	Medium	CCB_09_25_2003_item2
	<p><b>Request:</b> In order to provide flexibility in the End of Year Processing for the Grants Management community, it is requested that the run time for the Award Reverse Bridge be modified. Instead of running at <b>5:15 pm on 9/26/2003</b> it is requested that this run be made on <b>Sunday 9/28/2003 at 6:00 pm</b>. It is also requested that beginning on <b>Monday, 9/29/2003</b> the Award Reverse Bridge be run at <b>6:00 pm</b> instead of the currently scheduled <b>5:00 p.m.</b></p> <p>By making these changes, this will give the grants management community 1 extra day to make changes to awards that are released on Friday 9/26 – Sunday 9/28.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> 1. (Amir Venegas) Modify the offline job turnover document to reflect change.</p>				
19	Sara Silver	CGAP	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_25_2003_item3
	<p><b>Request:</b> Correction handling for the CGAP exchange needs an additional verification. When a trading partner submits a correction, the correction ticket includes an accession number. There is currently no verification that the accession number is correct. CGAP processing deletes the application associated with the indicated accession number and replaces it with the new submission. Since there is no validation to check that the accession number is really for one of that trading partner or PI's previous submissions, CGAP will delete any appls_t record it finds with that accession number - including other organization's submissions or even awarded grants that were not received electronically.</p> <p>Therefore, a requirement is being added to the Process Ticket use case to check the accession number on a correction ticket, to make sure it matches an accession number previously submitted electronically by the same institution and PI. If the accession number does not match, the correction should be rejected.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> 1. Time estimates should reflect 5 hrs of integration testing.</p>				
20	Vanessa Grandy	IEdison II	Requirements Change	Low	CCB_09_25_2003_item4



	<b>Request:</b> Bug 4871 is a bug reported that identifies that two fields are missing from the Add Patent and Modify Patent screens which would allow a user to link patents by providing the child patent criteria. Removal of this bug from the October scope will have a low impact to user because they are able to link patents by providing parent patent criteria already. In addition, it was identified by the development team that allowing this feature could possible introduce some problems with other features of the system. As a result, we do not want to implement this until we have more time to consider the overall impact and best design to use in moving forward.				
	<b>Decision:</b> Approved				
21	Vanessa Grandy	IEdison II	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_25_2003_item5
	<b>Request:</b> Bug 5999 is a bug reported that identifies that the reporting period is incorrectly stated on the Utilization page. The correction of utilization reporting was already previously scoped for correction by October 2003, and as a result, requirements were distributed and baselined which clarified how the reporting period should be determined. This particular bug which relates to the clarifications made has since been reported by a user and needs to be included with the list of bugs to be fixed and verified for October 2003.				
	<b>Decision:</b> Approved				
22	Vanessa Grandy	IEdison II	Requirements Change	High	CCB_09_25_2003_item6
	<b>Request:</b> The group advocate has reported that the current weekly report being received is not usable. As a result, the requirements for some of data elements to be shown on the report are further clarified and changes to the arrangement of the content have been made in the "Generate Weekly Report Email" use case. In addition, the report needs to be formatted. Currently it is sent as a text report via email. The requirement change is to have the report emailed in HTML format. All the changes suggested are to make the report usable and to provide information to administrators accessing the iEdison system of pertinent information that they need for various purposes.				
	<b>Decision:</b> Defer				
	<b>Notes:</b> 1. Internal report; carries too much risk to schedule				
23	Vanessa Grandy	IEdison II	Requirements Change	Critical	CCB_09_18_2003_item7
	<b>Request:</b> We are requesting to deploy iEdison Version 2.0.2.0. This is a build containing many of the bug fixes planned for October. But due to the number of bug fixes planned for October and test resource risks, we would like to at least promote this version to production for which system integration and acceptance testing is almost complete.				
	We will only deploy once we obtain confirmation that the testing is complete and there are no major issues that would have to be addressed. So far, all looks well.				
	<b>Decision:</b> Approved following completion of acceptance testing				
	<b>Notes:</b> 1. Can get ~300 bug fixes out.				
24	Mark Siegert	Peer Review	Scope Reduction	?	CCB_09_25_2003_item8
	<b>Request:</b> The EPMS working group has not made a decision regarding modifications to the percentile functionality in the Peer Review Module. Therefore, the 40 hours of development time that had been allotted for this system change is no longer necessary.				
	<b>Decision:</b> Approved				
25	Mark Siegert	Peer Review	Requirements Change	?	CCB_09_25_2003_item9

	<p><b>Request:</b> A requirement was overlooked for the November 2003 release of Peer Review. Specifically, the policy staff of OER (including Dr. Seto) as well as a number of Business Office officials from the grantee institutions have requested that a copy of the Review Result (Score) Mailers sent to the PI with instructions for submission of Just-in-Time (JIT) material also be sent to the business office of the grantee institution via email. The version of the mailer sent to the business office would exclude the score and percentile and should be incorporated into the common mailing system that currently sends the ROTs. A sample is provided on the following page. The email address to be used is located in external_org_addresses_t where the addr_seq_num and external_org_id = the bus_ofc_addr_seq_num and the external_org_id from appls_t. A copy of the email would be generated each time a copy of the JIT mailer is generated to the PI.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Pending Approval for Fall release</p> <p><b>Actions:</b> 1. (Mike Wilson) Verify work can be absorbed in schedule.</p>				
	Tracy Soto	All-Password Policy	Requirements/ Clarification Change	Medium	CCB_09_25_2003_w1
W1	<p><b>Request:</b> Based on meetings with developers and ISSO, a few clarifications need to be added to the Password Policy Scope Document for the November release.</p> <p>An example of one item that has changed in the document: The words “change” and “reset” password were used interchangeably in the Scope and this needs to be clarified to say only “change” because reset implies generation of a random password.</p> <p>These clarifications should be made to avoid any confusion and inconsistencies. Also, a UI prototype for the Change Password utility has been completed and is added to the document for reference. The Password Policy Scope Document with track changes turned on is attached.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Approved</p>				
	Tim Twomey	Commons	Change to baseline configuration	High	Emergency
E1	<p><b>Request:</b> We have been experiencing significant table locking problems in Production Commons. Through Analysis the problem appears when a user deletes an account at the same time the Matched Profiles query is executed during the Create Account process. We believe that the lack of two indexes on MATCHED_ROLES_T is at least partially responsible for this critical problem, which causes Commons sessions to hang for 7 or 8 minutes before completing, which is putting a load on IMPP (see CQ13177 for more information). The MATCHED_ROLES_T table is only used by the Commons processes associated with the Commons Maintain Profiles process so applying these indexes in production is considered low risk. Furthermore, Testing of this problem (and the isolation of it during Testing) is problematic since the tables in DEV and TEST are much smaller than what now exists in production. Therefore, we request that these indexes be applied at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p><b>Decision:</b> Tim Twomey and Paul Markovitz approved this item as an emergency change for immediate deployment.</p>				